

and that CAFTA will have, it is cut from the same cloth as those two trade agreements. Certainly neither the United States nor Bahrain is likely to benefit when the trade agreement's rules of origin provisions invite gaming. As Robert Baugh, executive director of the AFL-CIO, testified before the Senate Finance Committee, the provision permits multinational corporations to manipulate production and purchasing "to ship goods made primarily in third countries through Bahrain for a minimal transformation before entering the U.S. duty free. The rule of origin fails to promote production and employment in the U.S. and Bahrain, and it grants benefits to third-party countries that have provided no reciprocal benefits under the agreement and that are not subject to the agreement's minimal labor and environmental standards."

Mr. President, Wisconsin has paid a heavy price for our trade policy in recent years. Since 2000, Wisconsin has lost nearly 92,000 manufacturing jobs. NAFTA, the GATT, and Most Favored Nation treatment for China have devastated local businesses and punished working families, taking away family-supporting jobs, and offering lower paying jobs, if any, in return. I regret that this trade agreement promises more of the same. Instead of building on this failed model of trade, we should scrap it and establish a new model of trade that is fair to American businesses, workers, and farmers, as well as the small businesses, workers and farmers of our trading partners.

PATRIOT ACT IMPROVEMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the people of Vermont are proud of the important role that Senator PATRICK LEAHY is serving in trying to improve the USA PATRIOT Act.

My colleague from Vermont rightly believes that security and civil liberties need not be mutually exclusive objectives. We can and we should advance both goals. As the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY worked closely with Chairman ARLEN SPECTER in helping to produce a bipartisan bill to renew and improve the USA PATRIOT Act. That bill was unanimously approved both by the Judiciary Committee and by the Senate. Now he is working with Senators of both parties in trying to win further improvements in the proposed conference report on that bill.

Just as he did in 2001, then as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the leader of the Senate's negotiations with the administration in crafting the initial USA PATRIOT Act, Senator LEAHY now, once again, has worked tirelessly to ensure that we do not hastily pass flawed legislation. Back in the fall of 2001, the Bush administration had demanded that Congress pass the PATRIOT Act in 1 week. The Senator from Vermont knew that rushing such an expansive law through Con-

gress was a mistake, and he secured more time, allowing Congress to add crucial checks and balances to the law. In the best tradition of the Senate, Senator PATRICK LEAHY has championed effective law enforcement and the rights and freedoms that we cherish as Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that two recent editorials which have spotlighted these issues and Senator LEAHY's role be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bennington Banner, Dec. 9, 2005]

A REAL GREEN MOUNTAIN PATRIOT

Much has been said about what makes someone a patriot. Sadly much of it has come as a result of the response to the terrorists attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on Sept. 11, 2001. What makes that sad is that an outside attack should have—and did for a brief time—brought the country closer together.

That has been fractured by political opportunists who responded to the attacks with legislation that Americans would never have accepted before their confidence was rattled so vehemently.

One such piece of legislation is the provocatively named USA Patriot Act. The Patriot legislation was drafted to give the government a way to fight terrorism. No one would argue that's an important and necessary goal.

But it contains too many provisions that we find unacceptable despite the fact that we remain staunchly anti-terrorist and pro-America. (We're cutting off that argument at the pass. . .)

The scariest provision is one that allows the government to get warrants that would allow them to find out what books someone is reading or checking out of the library.

That's un-American enough in a society that prides itself on the free and open exchange of ideas. What's worse is that we wouldn't know what books or articles are on that list that makes a reader a suspect.

To make it scarier, those warrants are requested and granted in secret.

We know that there are armchair generals who are rushing to point out that this is the kind of action needed to fight enemies like terrorists. We remain unconvinced that such secret warrants would make us much different or better than nations that support terrorists.

Nor can we justify giving a tool like this to the federal government under an administration that can't convince its people or the world that it's not engaging in torture. We suspect there will be more Abu Ghraibs before the War on Terror is finished.

So what makes somebody a patriot? How about standing up against faulty legislation even when a nation that's still in fear may support that law? Maybe it's recognizing the lessons of history and trying to protect our country from another shameful incident like the imprisonment of Japanese citizens during World War II?

That's exactly what Sen. Patrick Leahy, the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, is doing by refusing to sign a version of the Patriot Act that would extend these powers for four years.

We're proud that a patriot like that is serving the people of Vermont.

[From USA Today, Dec. 14, 2005]

QUALMS ABOUT ANTI-TERROR LAW UNITE THE LEFT AND RIGHT

Patrick J. Leahy first made his name in politics as a tough-on-crime, attention-grab-

bing county prosecutor in the turbulent late 1960s and early '70s. His law-and-order aggressiveness propelled him to election as the first—and, so far, only—Democrat to represent historically Republican Vermont in the U.S. Senate.

After the 9/11 attacks, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Leahy helped shepherd the questionably named "USA Patriot Act" through Congress. Reassuring a frightened nation, the Patriot Act granted unprecedented powers to law enforcement, some of which are set to expire at the end of this year.

Federal investigators and prosecutors have welcomed the law as providing a clutch of much-needed tools in the war on terrorism. Indeed, much of the act is a good fit for threatening times.

But it's also something else: cover for sweeping invasions of citizens' privacy, secret fishing expeditions into privately held records and muzzling of targets who want to complain about it.

All are convenient for law enforcement. All have already been abused.

This year's rewrite fails to solve these problems and, in fact, would add provisions that have nothing to do with terrorism (see box at right).

Leahy is a useful barometer of just how troubling the latest legislation is.

Today, the former prosecutor is leading a bipartisan coalition in the Senate seeking to block renewal of some of the PATRIOT Act's most controversial provisions until more is done to curb the potential for assaults on privacy and civil liberties. "This much unchecked power doesn't make us any safer," Leahy told us Tuesday. "It makes us less safe. . . . Ultimately, you're secure only if you maintain basic liberties."

Other Senate critics of the bill range the full breadth of the political spectrum, from Idaho Republican LARRY CRAIG to Wisconsin Democrat RUSS FEINGOLD. Their bid to hold up the legislation is a worthy one.

Since Sept. 11, 2001, using the Patriot Act and stretching authority under other laws, government investigators have collected private information on thousands of people who have no apparent connection to international terrorism. Secret sweeps have been made into library records, hotel bookings, car-rental files and other documents. That material is retained, perhaps forever, in government computers. In at least one case, a lawyer's home and office were searched based on false information.

The Bush administration and its allies in Congress have resisted calls for more meaningful protections against invasion of privacy and abuse of civil liberties. While some of the most troubling provisions have been modified in the latest changes, many of the revisions are cosmetic at best.

The pressure is on because portions of the PATRIOT Act, including several of the most troubling provisions, expire Dec. 31, and lawmakers are trying to get home for Christmas.

Leahy and his allies are proposing to extend the law for three months to allow more time to fix what's wrong. That makes sense. Mistakes made in the heat of post-9/11 anxiety shouldn't be compounded and extended based on an artificial deadline.

As Leahy and others have discovered, there's more to patriotism than the label on an antiterrorism law. True patriotism requires not only giving law enforcement the tools it needs, but also adequately protecting citizens against abuse of that power.